



# City of Tempe

MINUTES FOR THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(CAC) MEETING

5:30- 8:30 pm, February 21, 2002  
Public Works Conference Room

## ATTENDANCE:

Rich Nolan, Accessibility Consultant  
Kirby Spittler, Planning Commission  
Todd Marshall, Developer  
Kathryn Heffernan, Parking Consultant  
Mandi Roberts, Otak  
Roger Millar, Otak  
Bonnie Richardson, CD+D  
Grace Kelly, Planning

Darin Sender, Board of Adjustment, Planning Commission  
Michael DiDomenico, Planning Commission  
Cheri Edington, Board of Adjustment Chair  
Eric Emmert, Tempe Chamber of Commerce  
Scot Siegel, Otak  
Fred Brittingham, Planning  
Arlene Palisoc, Planning

## INTRODUCTION

- Overview of Module 2 rough draft.
- After the neighborhood meeting last night, Fred and Otak consultants, Roger and Scot, have decided to add two new people to the Citizen Advisory Committee, since there was a strong desire by some of the residents to be included in our rough draft phase. Rich Nolan drew the names of the people interested in joining the CAC. They were selected in the following order: Bill Butler, Karyn Gittlis, Darlene Tussing, Richard Erdmann, Thomas Hinchion, Margaret Tchida and Jenny Lucier. Bill Butler and Karyn Gittlis were selected as new CAC members. If they would not be able to serve, the next person on the list would have a chance to serve.
- Scot explained that there were not a lot of substantive changes to the Industrial Districts. It was put into a matrix to make it easier to read.
- Scot indicated that document and ordinances were reorganized to put the Design Standards in one place. Otak is trying to introduce transportation-efficient ideas and make development more pedestrian friendly. They are also trying to provide flexibility in code by saying one can build to standards or show that they can meet the purpose of the ordinance. Two-track system.
- Engineering Department would like to see engineering design standards as a reference if not in actual ordinance.
- Scot explained the Table of Contents and explained they are still working on the Sign ordinance.

## **PEDESTRIAN OVERLAY DISTRICT**

- Roger explained that Otak is handling the coordination of the Transportation plan, the Pedestrian Overlay District and the Ordinance Rewrite.
- Mandi described the Pedestrian Overlay District and showed the boundaries of the draft overlay.
- The General Plan and Comprehensive Transportation Plan are implemented through the pedestrian overlay on top of the base code and other code requirements.
- What can we do in addition to the base code to create a Pedestrian Overlay district? The Pedestrian Overlay District occurs in the Design Review Process. Design Review is the mechanism used to pick up those additional guidelines.
- Draft Pedestrian Overlay District covers Transit Station Areas. A lot of communities with light rail have adopted community rail overlay areas. What we may want to do is broaden that along certain arterials.
- Mandi described the Table of Contents and the organization for the Ped Overlay District.
- Kathryn: What does Principal-Use Parking mean?
- Roger: Commercial lots. Parking Garage for park-n-ride is okay. Definitions will be added to this document.
- Eric: Why have Street Façade requirements?
- Roger: Research has shown that people will not walk along blank walls or surface lots. We want to encourage people to walk.

## **INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICTS**

- There were no comments.

## **COMMUNITY DESIGN STANDARDS**

- Applicability: Anything you do will trigger some section of the Community Design Standards. You may not need to meet ALL standards, you just need to follow parking or landscaping, for example.
- Darin: counseled a tenant who had a 400 s.f. addition who had 20 stipulations and had to put a lot of landscaping in. Excessive requirements.
- Scot: We still need to work on a clarification of process/applicability.

## Engineering Design Criteria

- Cheri: How do you distinguish what is requirement and what is not?
- Roger: You can distinguish and explain why it is policy in the code and put technical standards.
- Kirby: City of Phoenix code explains why the codes are written as they are: why there are 20' driveway widths and why the measurement for parking space is designed as it is.
- Darin: Agrees. We have "Purpose" sections but we should have "intent" sections. In Phoenix does , it says "this is why you should have a berm or wall" It gives room for creative solutions. On Board of Adjustment we see a lot of Design issues that need variances but we don't know why a variance is needed or why the code reads as it does to begin with.
- Consensus of the group is that Each Design Standards should list the "intent" of that standard.
- Rich: If you have "intent" you can understand exceptions, modifications.
- Rich: In Section 3-203, If you mean "people with ambulatory problems", say that rather than just "ambulatory".
- Darin: Can we strike: "when ordinances are in conflict, the most restrictive shall apply"?
- Roger: The new code will have flexibility to follow standards or come up with alternatives which should offer balance for that.
- Bonnie: In Engineering Design Standards, some arbitrary questions over who administers document, Planning or Public Works.
- Kirby: Concern about Engineers perception of streets for cars primarily.
- Fred: New administration more progressive about streets serving many uses, compared to previous administration.
- Todd: I know someone who had an approved PAD and Plat that Engineering would not sign off on.
- Darin: Can we look at or double –check the Engineering Design Criteria and zoning ordinance changes to check for compatibility?

## CPTED

- Todd: When we're tying all legal documents into this document , eg. CPTED, there is concern about making CPTED guidelines "ordinance". Today, we can negotiate, but if we adopt CPTED as ordinance, we may be out of luck.
- Roger M.: We are making CPTED a part of ordinance and trying to find middle ground between landscaping requirements and CPTED landscaping standards.

- Fred: We'll still have CPTED guidelines.
- Todd: I read that every item is code and that is a concern. I think the "intent" of CPTED is great, but the administering of CPTED is what I have problems with.
- Darin: I don't have problems with guidelines, but I do have problems with CPTED as ordinance.
- Roger: The question for the CAC is what should be in the code and what should be referenced in the code?
- Rich: Section 3-404 says Landscaping plans shall "provide visual screening, privacy and natural surveillance" which is contradictory and doesn't make sense. Also, in the section about trees for shade, trees with canopies are good for early in the day but we need shade from the late afternoon sun.
- Bonnie: We need to add language to require more landscaping in parking lots.
- Fred: In Section 3-404, it gives Option 1: 10% of all parking lots are shaded or Option 2 – Canopy of tree or shade canopy at x % of parking area.
- Kirby: One could use colored paving materials as an alternative paving which could resolve storm drainage retention problems. Also, building uses change over time and it was disheartening to see developers building too much parking. I would like to see parking lots used for secondary uses.
- Rich: We discuss comfort in Section 30-304, but it should mean "ease " for non-ambulatory people.
- Mandi: we can show "reduced vibration zone" and treatment for edges of that.
- Rich: Section 3-304, B.2.b " take out "reasonably" in " reasonably free from hazards."
- Darin : section 3-303 B., what is an access permit?
- Scot: Curb cut.
- Bonnie: Can we categorize each section by : purpose, intent, procedure, standards, guidelines?
- Scot: The final piece fo the ordinance will describe how you can do something and will tie in the first two sections.

## **Vehicular Access to Local vs. Arterial Streets**

- Darin: Section 3-303 F—Why allow vehicular access to local street? Stick with arterials.
- Mandi: We'd like to see planters in medians, but if you have curb cuts on arterials, it prohibits smooth flow of bicycles and pedestrians, and you have less landscaping opportunities.
- Kirby: Recently, there was a proposal for a restaurant that had a curb cut on University. In our neighborhood, we are concerned about thru-traffic in the neighborhood. If a grocery store comes into

the neighborhood, how will a store function without curb-cuts on University? I think more curbcuts on a major arterial is better.

- Kathryn: I have problem with saying flatly "have access on a local street" in the ordinance.
- Roger: the intent is that the facility is on the corner and the access is on the less-intensive street (local collectors)

## **CONCLUSION AND PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- Fred: You have until March 7 to put your comments in writing.
- Fred opens the meeting to public comments.
- Art Jacobs: I live a block from the Pedestrian Overlay District and that means nothing to me or my neighbors. In the document, tell us the difference between what you proposed and what it was. A while ago, the General Plan was calling for high rises on the corner of Mill and Southern. Page 3-17 says you can have an RV Pad if you have a certain amount of square footage on your lot, which is discriminatory. Why is this committee representing me, when they are not like me or my neighbors? We pay 25 million dollars a year for transit tax for light rail. You should turn the excess parking lots (that may become vacant if light rail ameliorates some parking space requirements) into green spaces instead of allowing developers to building more. I wish you would ask us first.
- Richard "Sarge" Erdmann: Someday, some of you are not going to be here. Clarity would help people down the road understand why you did what you did. It would be helpful to show clearly in laymans' terms, what the standards used to be and what is proposed. In these flexibility standards, it would be nice to use "shade" e.g. as an objective. Use diagrams to show how to design street and trees for shade.
- Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.